

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed October 19, 2004. Claims 1-25 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-25 were rejected. Claims 1-25 remain pending in the Application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

In the Office Action, the following actions were taken or matters were raised:

SECTION 102 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-3, 6-7, 9-19, and 21-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,687,745 issued to Franco et al. (hereinafter "*Franco*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Of the rejected claims, Claims 1, 12, 17, and 22 are independent. Applicants respectfully submit that *Franco* does not disclose or even suggest each and every limitation as recited by independent Claims 1, 12, 17 and 22. For example, Applicants respectfully submit that *Franco* does not disclose or even suggest "enabling dragging of a graphical representation of said selected application towards a graphical representation of a compartment of said trusted operating system" as recited by Claim 1, "displaying a graphical representation of a plurality of compartments of said trusted operating system" and "enabling dragging of a graphical representation of said application towards a graphical representation of a compartment of said plurality of compartments" as recited by Claim 12, "a display portion displaying at least one compartment of said trusted operating system" and "dropping of said graphical representation of said at least one application on a graphical representation of said at least one compartment" as recited by Claim 17, and "enabling selection of an application from one or more applications" and "enabling association of said selected application with a compartment of the trusted operating system" as recited by Claim 22.

In the Office Action, the Examiner refers to column 19, line 64, to column 20, line 14, of *Franco* as purportedly disclosing a system enabling dragging and dropping of a graphical

representation of a selected application towards a graphical representation of a compartment of a trusted operating system (Office Action, pages 3, 5 and 7). Applicants respectfully disagree. *Franco* appears to disclose a system for storing an interactive link on a client computer to a remote resource (*Franco*, abstract). *Franco* also appears to disclose that the link to the remote resource may comprise a graphical element or representation, such as on a desktop, such that a user may select the element to initiate communications with the remote resource (*Franco*, column 20, lines 1-15). However, *Franco* does not disclose or even suggest “a graphical representation of a compartment of a trusted operating system” (emphasis added) as recited at least by Claims 1, 12 and 17, nor does the Examiner explicitly identify any such disclosure in *Franco*. To the contrary, the graphical representation referred to by the Examiner in *Franco* appears to be limited to the link to the remote resource. Therefore, for at least this reason, *Franco* does not anticipate at least Claims 1, 12 and 17.

Further, the Examiner asserts that *Franco* purportedly discloses a trusted operating system because the system of *Franco* recognizes a file type of an attachment (Office Action, pages 3 and 7). Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants respectfully submit that *Franco* does not disclose or even suggest that the operating system of *Franco* is a “trusted” operating system, nor does *Franco* disclose or even suggest a compartmentalized “trusted” operating system. Applicants respectfully submit that the recognition of a particular file type, without more, does not establish a “trusted” operating system. Therefore, for at least this reason also, *Franco* does not anticipate Claims 1, 12, 17 or 22.

Claims 2-3, 6-7, 9-11, 13-16, 18-19, 21 and 23-24 that depend respectively from independent Claims 1, 12, 17 and 22 are also not anticipated by *Franco* at least because they incorporate the limitations of respective Claims 1, 12, 17 and 22 and also add additional elements that further distinguish *Franco*. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 2-3, 6-7, 9-11, 13-16, 18-19, 21 and 23-24 be withdrawn.

SECTION 103 REJECTIONS

Claims 4-5, 20 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Franco* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,550,061 issued to Bearden et al (hereinafter *Bearden*). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Franco* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,795,963 issued to Andersen et al. (hereinafter "*Andersen*"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.


Claims 4-5, 8, 20 and 25 depend respectively from independent Claims 1, 17 and 22. As discussed above, Claims 1, 17 and 22 are allowable over the cited *Franco* reference. Further, neither *Bearden* nor *Andersen*, alone or in combination, remedy the deficiencies of *Franco*. Therefore, Claims 4-5, 8, 20 and 25 are also in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 4-5, 8, 20 and 25 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

No fee is believed due with this response. If, however, Applicants have overlooked the need for any fee due with this Response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment associated with this Response to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 of Hewlett-Packard Company.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
James L. Baudino
Reg. No. 43,486

Date: 1-18-05

Correspondence to:
L.Joy Griebenow
Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400
Tel. 970-898-3884